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Abstract

This document includes minutes of AMP TIG Telecon of June 27th 2023.

Version Tracking:

R0: Creating the minutes, June 27th.

# Tuesday 27 June 2023 @ 10:00-12:00 am ET

## Opening (IEEE 802.11-23/0930 r3)

* 1. Call to order 10:00 am ET.
  2. Chair instructed members to record attendance in IMAT.
  3. Chair introduced the patent policy and meeting rules (slides 2-8).
  4. No response to the call for patents.
  5. Chair introduced IEEE-SA COPYRIGHT POLICY (slides 9-10)
  6. Chair reviewed other Guidelines, Participation and Guideline for Straw Polls (slides 11-13).
  7. Chair reviewed current TC plan till July Plenary (slides 14).
  8. Hao Wang is taking minutes.
  9. Chair call for approval of the agenda of the AMP session.

## Agenda (IEEE 802.11-23/0930 r3)

* 1. Chair presented the agenda: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/23/11-23-0930-03-0amp-amp-sg-tc-agenda-till-jul-2023.pptx. (slide 20)
     + Call meeting to order and remind the group to record attendance on imat.ieee.org
     + IEEE-SA IPR policies and meeting rules
     + Approval of agenda
     + Contribution discussion
       - 11-23/1063, Further Discussion on Requirements for AMP Use Cases, Yinan Qi (OPPO)
       - 11-23/1073, device density in logistics, Joerg Robert (TU Ilmenau / Fraunhofer IIS)
       - 11-23/1064, Discussion on Frequency Band, Channel Bandwidth and Data Rate, Yinan Qi (OPPO)
       - 11-23/1074, Suggested PAR changes, Amichai Sanderovich (Wiliot)
       - 11-23/1006, ieee-802-11-amp-sg-proposed-par, Bo Sun (Sanechips)
     + Any other business?
     + Adjourn
  2. No objection, Agenda approved.

## Contribution and discussion

* 1. Presentation of IEEE 802.11-23/1063, Further Discussion on Requirements for AMP Use Cases, Yinan Qi (OPPO):

Q(uestion): I don’t agree with the density parameter in these use cases, the numbers seem too low. I submitted another contribution to show that higher density is required, and people want to monitor and track small items.

A: Not sure if AMP device would need to attach to everything. The cost for deployment would be too high.

Q: In some use case, the density is not always under control. Some customers require to attach the AMP tag to the pallet while others want to monitor the items. We need to consider how to scale the AMP technology to fit both use cases.

A: Agree. When designing the channel access scheme, rough estimation on the number of tags which simultaneously access to the network is necessary.

Comment: Agree with the first commentor, the density number seems low. Considering current retail case, every item is tagged and tracked from the factory to the store.

A: We assume that AMP device would be used for monitoring the high value goods. Not to compete with RFID in every use case.

Comment: In many use cases, we just don’t/can’t know the value of the customer products.

Comment: It seems not fair to directly compare the device density (device per square meter) of using AMP and RFID. The RFID reader can only cover very limited range compared to a Wi-Fi AP.

* 1. Presentation of IEEE 802.11-23/1073, device density in logistics, Joerg Robert (TU Ilmenau / Fraunhofer IIS)

Q(uestion): On slide 4, is it necessary to monitor temperature and moisture for every box?

A: Yes, it’s the customer requirement. You have to tag the boxes and monitor during the transportation.

Comment: AMP doesn’t intend to replace RFID in all use cases, especially for the low end market.

Comment (Chair): Need more information on the density in these use cases. If both sides can’t find common ground on these numbers, I will ask the group and run SP during July plenary.

* 1. Presentation of IEEE 802.11-23/1064, Discussion on Frequency Band, Channel Bandwidth and Data Rate, Yinan Qi (OPPO)

Q: Each option has its advantages and dis-advantages. The group can’t make decision at current stage. I’m not sure about the asymmetric design on slide 4.

A: Our intention is to list the pros and cons of each option. Do not seek agreement on specific value at current stage.

Comment: We should take cautions on using S1G band, because in Europe the bandwidth can’t go wider than 200khz unless the transmission is at very low level.

A: The target frequency band is still in discussion. These band may not be applied worldwide, only specific to certain area.

Q: I suggest not to nail down channel and bandwidth in the PAR doc. We should keep it as simple as possible. In addition, I’m in favor of using the consistent tech worldwide and avoid fragmentation.

A: This contribution is to list all the options and leave these to the group to decide. I don’t have any preference.

Chair: If the group can’t make consensus on these parameters before September interim, it will not be mentioned in the PAR doc.

* 1. Presentation of IEEE 802.11-23/1074, Suggested PAR changes, Amichai Sanderovich (Wiliot)

Comment: Some terms like ‘ultra low’ and ‘low’ are vague which Nescom tries to avoid. Do check with Lei and Dorothy and quantify these with numbers. I suggest mentioning the band infor in the PAR as other amendment does.

Comment: Several comments: 1. Not to specify other band except for S1G and 2.4Ghz, as these two bands have the group consensus. 2. The wording indicates separate design for DL and UL. May ‘duty cycle’ and other specific design also needs to be mentioned. 3. Change the wording like ‘define the procedure that enables sensor type application and positioning’. 4. Suggest to avoid wording which indicates per packet standalone co-existence. Volunteer to work on drafting the PAR.

A: Agree.

Comment: I also agree to not put specific data rate and band in the scope. Should not mention both co-existence and backward compatibility in the PAR.

* 1. Quick review on IEEE 802.11-23/1006, ieee-802-11-amp-sg-proposed-par, Bo Sun (Sanechips)

Chair: The PAR doc should be modified based on the motion results of the group.

Q: Current contribution #1006 is not the baseline, just the framework to further work on.

A: Agreed. In the upcoming F2F, the group will motion on the baseline texts.

Chair calls for submission on proposed texts for the PAR doc.

## Closing

* 1. Chair adjourned the teleconference at 11:48 am ET.